Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at University of California, Santa Cruz

Professional Services Division

June 19, 2000

Overview of This Report

This agenda report provides background information about the University of California, Santa Cruz and its credential programs, information about the accreditation visit, and the accreditation team report and recommendations. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On behalf of Lead Consultant, Joe Dear, Consultant Phil Fitch will introduce the report. Team Leader, Dennis Evans will present the report. Ellen Moir will represent the University.

Accreditation Recommendations

(1) The Team recommends that, based on the attached Accreditation Team Report, the Committee on Accreditation make the following accreditation decision for the University of California, Santa Cruz and all of its credential programs:

ACCREDITATION

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

- Multiple Subject Credential
  CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis
  CLAD/BCLAD Internship

- Single Subject Credential
  CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis

(2) Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.

- University of California, Santa Cruz be permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.

- University of California, Santa Cruz be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2005-2006 academic year.

Background Information

The University of California, Santa Cruz was established in 1965 on almost 3000 acres, nestled within giant redwoods and with sweeping vistas of the Monterey Bay. UC Santa Cruz is the second largest in size (UC Davis is the largest with 5200 acres), but the third smallest in enrollment among the nine campuses. Over 450 full time faculty and approximately 340 part time faculty offer 40 baccalaureate and 25 graduate programs. With a total university enrollment of 11,000, only about 100 students enroll each year in the teacher preparation program. Those numbers will jump to 150 next year and they are projected to increase to almost 250 by 2003. One of the primary reasons the university is able to increase so rapidly is their change in structure from a two-year experimental teacher preparation program to a one-year program.

UC Santa Cruz's Multiple Subject and Single Subject Teacher Education Credential Programs are CLAD and BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis. The Education Department's major goal is to prepare students to engage in the analysis and integration of educational theory, research and practice for a multilingual and multicultural society. The university states that its main focus is to meet the needs the limited English learner in the kindergarten through twelfth grade schools in the Santa Cruz and surrounding counties and is further expanding into the San Jose area. About three-quarters of the students pursue a Multiple Subject Credential.

The Teacher Preparation Program is a fifth year MA program, though students are encouraged to take some professional courses during their senior year. There is an approved subject matter program (Liberal Studies-teacher education) for a Multiple Subject Credential and a Single Subject Math credential. Candidates who do not meet the requirements of the approved Multiple Subject Program prove subject matter competence by achieving passing scores on the appropriate Praxis Series examinations.

The Education Department is housed within the Social Science Division and does not have a departmentalized faculty. Education faculty also draws on cross disciplinary knowledge from the social sciences. The Education Department has four instructional programs: 1) an Undergraduate minor in Education; 2) the UCSC Multiple and Sikngle Subjects CLAD/BCLAD credential programs; 3) the Master of Arts: Teaching that includes the teaching credential; and 4) a teacher induction program for all first and second year teachers in the region.

Preparation for the Accreditation Visit

The Commission staff consultant was assigned to the institution in Spring, 1998 and had telephone conversations with the university's accreditation coordinator in preparation for a formal meeting with the faculty which was held during the Summer of 1999. Subsequent meetings between the consultant and faculty, program directors, and institutional administration were held as needed. The initial meeting led to decisions

about team size, team configuration, standards to be used, format for the institutional self-study report, interview schedule, and logistical and organizational arrangements. In addition, telephone, e-mail, and regular mail communication was maintained between the staff consultant and institutional representatives. The Team Leader, Dr. Dennis Evans was selected in August 1999. The team size was agreed upon in August as well.

Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report

The Institutional Self-Study Report was prepared beginning with responses to the Common Standards. These responses were developed in reference to the credential programs. This was followed by separate responses to the Multiple Subject CLAD/BCLAD and Single Subject Program CLAD/BCLAD Standards. The institution decided to use option one (California Program Standards) in the *Accreditation Framework* for the Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential Programs.

Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team

Decisions about the structure and size of the team were made cooperatively between the department chair, education faculty and staff, and the Commission consultant. It was agreed that there would be a team of four, consisting of a team leader and three team members. The Commission consultant selected the team members to participate in the review. Team members were selected because of their expertise, experience, and adaptability, and trained in the use of the *Accreditation Framework.*

Intensive Evaluation of Program Data

Prior to the accreditation visit, team members received copies of the appropriate institutional reports and information from Commission staff on how to prepare for the visit. The COA team leader and members examined the college responses to the Common Standards and the program standards. The on-site phase of the review began on Sunday, May 7, 2000. The team arrived on Sunday afternoon and began deliberations with one another. The team meeting included a review of the accreditation procedures and organizational arrangements for the COA team members.

On Monday and Tuesday, May 8 and 9, 2000, the team collected data from interviews and reviewed institutional documents according to procedures outlined in the *Accreditation Handbook.* There was extensive consultation among the team members with much sharing of information. Lunch on Monday and Tuesday was spent sharing data that had been gathered from interviews and document review. The entire team met on Monday evening to discuss progress the first day and share information about findings. The mid-visit report was scheduled for 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday. The team had questions and concerns about one Common Standard and a few Program Standards going into the mid-visit report. The faculty and staff worked very hard Tuesday afternoon to obtain and present additional information for the team. Tuesday evening was set aside for additional team meetings and the writing of the team report. The team

completed writing the report on Tuesday evening, and presented it to the faculty and administration at 9:00 a.m. on Wednesday.

Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

Pursuant to the *Accreditation Framework,* and the *Accreditation Handbook*, the team prepared a report using a narrative format. For each of the Common Standards, the team made a decision of "Standard Met" or "Standard Not Met." The team had the option of deciding that some of the Common Standards were "Met Minimally" with either Quantitative or Qualitative Concerns. The team then wrote specific narrative comments about each standard providing a finding or rationale for its decision and then outlining perceived Strengths or Concerns relative to the standard.

The team prepared a narrative report about the program standards which pointed out any standards that were not met or not fully met and included explanatory information about findings related to the program standards. The team highlighted specific Strengths and Concerns related to the program

The team included some "Professional Comments" at the end of the report for consideration by the institution. These comments are to be considered as consultative advice from the team members, but are not binding on the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.

Accreditation Decisions by the Team

After the report was drafted, the team met Tuesday evening for a final review of the report and a decision about the results of the visit. The team discussed each Common Standard and each Program Standard and decided on the basis of interviews and program documents that seven of the eight Common Standards were fully met and all Program Standards were fully met. This led the team to recommend "Accreditation" for the University of California, Santa Cruz and all of its credential programs.

CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION - ACCREDITATION TEAM REPORT

Institution: University of California, Santa Cruz

Dates of Visit: May 7 - 10, 2000

Team Leader: Dennis Evans
University of California, Irvine

Team Member: Beverly Young
California State University, Office of the Chancellor

Team Member: Donna Uyemoto
New Haven Unified School District

Team Member: Karen Wheeler
Fresno Unified School District

**Accreditation Team
Recommendation:** **ACCREDITATION**

Rationale:

The team recommendation for Accreditation was the result of a review of the Institutional Self Study Report, a review of additional supporting documents available during the visit, and interviews with administrators, faculty, students, local school personnel and other individuals professionally associated with the unit. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the unit was based upon the following:

1. <u>Common Standards</u> - The Common Standards were first reviewed one-by-one and then agreed upon by the team. All but one was judged to have been fully met.

2. <u>Program Standards</u> - Findings about program standards were presented to team members, they were each discussed and were found to be met by all members of the team.

The recommendation was based on the unanimous agreement of the team. The team felt that the concerns which are stated in the report were not sufficient to designate stipulations for the institution. The team determined that the institution provides quality credential programs with no important deficiencies in preparing competent candidates for the teaching profession

DATA SOURCES

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED		DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	
17	Program Faculty	X	Catalog
3	Institutional Administration	X	Institutional Self Study
43	Candidates	X	Course Syllabi
27	Graduates	X	Candidate Files
5	Employers of Graduates	X	Fieldwork Handbook
16	Supervising Practitioners	X	Follow-up Survey Results
11	Advisors	X	Needs Analysis Results
13	School Administrators	X	Information Booklet
1	Credential Analyst	X	Field Experience Notebook
0	Advisory Committee	X	Schedule of Classes
2	Department Staff	X	Advisement Documents
		X	Faculty Vitae

Common Standards

Common Standard 1 – Education Leadership   **Standard Met**

Rationale
One of the distinguishing features of the UCSC credential program vís a vís education leadership is the understanding that exists at all levels of leadership regarding the program's sense of mission and the related program design. An excellent working relationship seems to exist between and among the unit's Dean, chair, and director as well as with the campus-level administration. In spite of issues related to planned growth and numerous changes in program delivery and involved personnel, the department continues to find its focus in the contemporary needs of public education and in particular in its role in the preparation of teachers to serve culturally and linguistically diverse students.

The department's leadership has proactively accepted the challenges implicit in doubling the enrollment in the credential programs and is currently guiding the department through the transitions attendant to this goal. Obviously this would not be

occurring without the advocacy and support of other levels of leadership on the campus.

Decision-making in the department has been characterized by involvement of all levels of faculty and has included, when appropriate, student representation. In the intern program leadership responsibilities as legally mandated were shared with participating school districts (Some concerns were expressed regarding the lack of faculty involvement in the governance of the intern program).

Strengths
The team commends the department chair for her ability to obtain resources for the department allowing for program expansion. The team also commends the director of the program for her leadership and her major contributions to teacher education and professional development state-wide.

Concerns
As noted in the department's self-study this accreditation visit occurs in midst of a major transition from a relatively small, two year experimental program to a much larger 15 month program. The accreditation process, including the work of the visiting team, would seem to be of greatest potential value to the department if there were at least some attention given to potential issues related to transition. In the area of program leadership the team suggests that the informality of processes and procedures which was very compatible with the nature of the small, two-year program, might prove to be problematic in a larger, 15 month program.

Common Standard 2 – Resources   **Standard Met**

Rationale
Resource support for departmental efforts is currently adequate, however the transition to a larger program enrollment conducted in a shorter time-span carries with it certain considerations that the departmental leadership is well aware of and is taking steps to address.

Facilities – Both instructional and office space requirements for the expanded program need careful study and timely resolution.

Staff and faculty – This crucial resource is also being addressed and a number of ladder-rank positions have been authorized. Particular attention should be focused on administrative and staff resources directly associated with the credential program. The exemplary roles now played by the department manager, the credential analyst/advisor, and other support staff must be augmented in anticipation of the increased student load and related contingencies. The role of the Director of Credential Programs, which now requires the incumbent to wear many hats, needs to be studied in order to relieve the position of certain operational responsibilities such as student placement and the coordination of supervisors.

Budget – The chair, dean, and other campus level administration are to be commended for the provision of budget allocations which according to the department's self-study

are quite fair. The self-study states: "The Department of Education has received more than its fair share of the budget" (p.30 self-study document). However, that same document states that, "Part of this is due to the recent UC initiatives related to increasing the number of teachers that UC produces."

Strengths
None noted

Concerns
Some concerns were expressed that this additional funding might be considered as one-time   "start-up" money and thus not be institutionalized as part of the regular departmental budget

Common Standard 3 – Faculty   **Standard Met**

Rationale
The department is rightfully proud of the expertise of the faculty working in the credential programs. A number of ladder-rank faculty regularly teach in the program and enrich it with their particular research expertise. The department has also made it explicitly clear on job descriptions for potential ladder-rank positions of the expectation that the selected individuals will be involved in the credential program.   The department has also made excellent use of a "Teachers in Residence" approach to bring exemplary and experienced teachers to the department who then serve as full-time clinical faculty for two to three year periods.   These individuals make major contributions in teaching and in the supervision of student teachers. Their employment signals the department's recognition of practitioner expertise and the value of collaboration between the university and the K-12 community.

Faculty members share the departmental commitment to work toward improving the schooling of culturally and linguistically diverse populations and thus much faculty research and expertise is directed to that end. Program faculty have also taken the lead in developing programs which involve undergraduates in an education minor as well as programs which provide support for beginning teachers during their induction years.

Evaluation of program faculty is based, in part, on student course evaluations which are used in retention and promotion decisions. Recruitment and hiring procedures are governed by and consistent with pertinent campus and system policies.

Strengths
Students feel the field supervisors are the central link between theory and practice.

Concerns
This standard requires that the performance of field supervisors be regularly evaluated. While candidates are asked to evaluate these supervisors in the context of their seminar instruction, there is no formal and objective process for obtaining candidate or master teacher feedback on the quality of supervision provided in terms of observations,

feedback offered, etc. No evidence was provided to show that this evaluation is done by any other process.

An additional concern involved the perception of several students who indicated during interviews with the accreditation team that they did not think that communication among program faculty was adequate. The students suggested that redundancies in course content/assignments and/or lack of continuity among courses provide evidence of that lack of communication.

Common Standard 4 – Evaluation   **Standard Met**

Rationale
The department utilizes a combination of formal and informal approaches in program evaluation. Formal mechanisms include student course evaluations, university external and internal evaluation processes, and evaluation surveys to area employers. Informal mechanisms include contact and communication with program graduates involved with professional growth activities such as the university administered New Teacher Project and Subject Matter Projects, feedback sessions with students, and feedback from the Santa Cruz County New Teacher Advisory Committee.

Strengths
None noted

Concerns
It does not appear that a formal evaluation plan is regularly implemented.

Standard 5 – Admissions   **Standard Met**

Rationale
The department's procedures related to admissions follow university policy. Information related to admissions requirements is provided to interested students in a timely fashion. The department uses multiple criteria in making admission decisions. A number of department faculty are involved in reviewing applicant files. The department has been proactive in attempting to recruit under-represented minorities into the program. Such efforts have not as yet resulted in increased enrollment of such students.

Strengths
None noted

Concerns
None noted

Standard 6 – Advice and Assistance   **Standard Met**

Rationale

Faculty, staff, and program leadership are involved in providing timely advice and assistance to students. A Student Teacher Handbook which contains important information regarding the program is provided to all candidates. Periodic checks are made on student progress toward completion of the program. The department has a "red flag" process which identifies students who might be experiencing problems during the program. Appropriate personnel then work with the involved student to resolve the problem.

Strengths
The credential analyst does an excellent job of maintaining proper records and documentation related to program requirements and the credentialing process.

Concerns
There is no evidence that a formal procedure is in place to provide for the discontinuation of candidates who have proven to be unsuitable in terms of their field performance. Some K-12 partners also expressed concern that they were unaware of processes related to this contingency. As the program expands, it will become even more important that the processes and protocols related to this issue are made evident to students and K-12 partners. Issues of due process and appeal in this area also need to be formalized and published in the student handbook.

Standard 7 – Collaboration   **Standard Met**

Rationale
There is much evidence that a strong sense of collaboration exists between the program and the K-12 community. Much of this emanates from the excellent reputation of the credential program and the major contributions made to school districts through professional development opportunities such as subject matter projects and the New Teacher project. Several advisory boards exist which bring together representatives of the university and the K-12 community.

Strengths
The program director is held in high regard by the K-12 community.

Concerns
It is obvious that the program values the importance of the master teacher role, but written procedures and criteria do not appear to be followed in all cases to ensure that appropriate field placements are always attained. Some student teachers reported that they were allowed to select their own sites and master teachers.

Standard 8 – District Field Supervisors   **Standard Met Minimally**
                                                      With Qualitative Concerns

Rationale
While the university offers opportunities for master teachers to obtain training, that training is basically optional. While many master teachers are experienced in their role, there is insufficient evidence to indicate that there is a formal process in place to assure that all master teachers receive training. Informal training is provided by supervisors, but again, when the program is preparing to expand dramatically, it will become even more essential that a systematic process is in place to ensure that all master teachers are trained.

Additionally, the standard calls for the evaluation of master teachers, with a collaborative process that includes the candidate. While candidates are asked whether or not the program should continue to place students with a master teacher, there is no formal and objective process for obtaining candidate feedback on each master teacher's effectiveness and skills. The department does have criteria for the selection of master teachers but they do not appear to be consistently applied.

Strengths
The PDS model in place at Starlight Elementary School is an excellent example of how a collaborative process can provide an outstanding experience for candidates.

Concerns

None noted

Program Standards

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional self-study and supporting documentation as well as completion of interview of candidates, faculty, graduates, site administrators, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met.

Concerns
Although finding all program standards fully met, the team did wish to point out concerns related to following three program standards:

Standard 3 - Orientation to Human Development and Equity
There is evidence from current candidates and graduates that preparation offered in human development was not sufficient. The team recognizes that this is feedback that the university has also received from other sources, and that the education department recognizes this as a concern that will be addressed in the new program.

Standard 7 - Field Experience Prior to Student Teaching
There is evidence that the current field experience/supervision approach may not provide faculty sufficient opportunity to determine if a candidate is prepared for daily

teaching responsibilities. Since university supervision is only provided in quarters 1, 5, and 6, there is necessarily a great reliance on master teachers to provide this input and judgment. The team recognizes that this concern is addressed in the structure of the new program.

Standard 10 - **Readiness for Diverse Responsibilities**
There is evidence that candidates teach students of diverse ages and abilities, and assume other responsibilities of full-time teachers. Concern was raised by candidates, master teachers, and principals that the set-up of classroom and the opening of school is only experienced by those students who take the initiative to report to their 4th quarter assignment prior to the start of the UCSC fall quarter. Since candidates are assigned to their 2nd year student teaching assignment prior to the end of their 1st year, it should be feasible for the students to be required to experience the opening of school. Students could be informed of the report dates of the various schools prior to their departure for the summer.

Professional Comments

(These comments and observations from the team are only for the use of the institution. They are to be considered as consultative advice from team members, but are not binding on the institution. They are not considered as part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.)

The program is committed to the preparation of future educational leaders. The graduates are well qualified, thoughtful and reflective educators. The team was very impressed by the graduates expression of wanting even more training in the areas of early literacy, classroom management, lesson plan design and subject content. Graduates consistently reported that their preparation has served them well in their teaching positions.